Supplemental Document

Biomedical Optics EXPRESS

Systematic meta-analysis of computer-aided detection to detect early esophageal cancer using hyperspectral imaging: supplement

Wei-Chih Liao,[1,2] Arvind Mukundan,[3] Cleorita Sadiaza,[4] Yu-Ming Tsao,[3] Chien-Wei Huang,[5,6,9,†] and Hsiang-Chen Wang[3,7,8,10,†,]

[1]*Department of Internal Medicine, National Taiwan University Hospital, National Taiwan University College of Medicine, Taipei, Taiwan*
[2]*Graduate Institute of Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan*
[3]*Department of Mechanical Engineering, National Chung Cheng University, 168, University Rd., Min Hsiung, Chia Yi 62102, Taiwan*
[4]*Department of Mechanical Engineering, Far Eastern University, P. Paredes St., Sampaloc, Manila, 1015, Philippines*
[5]*Department of Gastroenterology, Kaohsiung Armed Forces General Hospital, 2, Zhongzheng 1st.Rd., Lingya District, Kaohsiung City 80284, Taiwan*
[6]*Department of Nursing, Tajen University, 20, Weixin Rd., Yanpu Township, Pingtung County 90741, Taiwan*
[7]*Department of Medical Research, Dalin Tzu Chi Hospital, Buddhist Tzu Chi Medical Foundation, No. 2, Minsheng Road, Dalin, Chiayi, 62247, Taiwan*
[8]*Director of Technology Development, Hitspectra Intelligent Technology Co., Ltd., 4F., No. 2, Fuxing 4th Rd., Qianzhen Dist., Kaohsiung City 80661, Taiwan*
[9]*forevershiningfy@yahoo.com.tw*
[10]*hcwang@ccu.edu.tw*
[†]*These authors contributed equally.*

Supplement DOI: https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.23638773

Parent Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.1364/BOE.492635

SYSTEMATIC META-ANALYSIS OF COMPUTER-AIDED DETECTION TO DETECT EARLY ESOPHAGEAL CANCER USING HYPERSPECTRAL IMAGING: SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENT

S1. Literature Search

Articles used in this study were independently searched by two authors on the web specifically, in the Google Scholar search engine. Literature from recent years (2017-2022) was selected for this review. Any article duplications were disregarded. The process of reviewing the titles and abstracts of the identified articles was necessary to avoid the inclusion of articles irrelevant to the purpose of this review. Furthermore, full-text reviews were done to be able to determine whether the articles met the criteria for inclusion.

S1.1 Inclusion Criteria

This review intends to focus on studies by the established inclusion criteria:

(1) studies should have definitive numerical results such as dataset, sensitivity, accuracy, precision, and area under the curve (AUC).

(2) based on hyperspectral imaging dealing with esophageal cancer detection.

(3) must be published in the last 6 years.

(4) publication journal must have an H-index of greater than 50 and must be in the first quartile (Q1).

(5) studies that have a prospective or retrospective design.

(6) studies written in English.

S1.2 Exclusion Criteria

This review will disregard studies that will fall under the following exclusion criteria:

(1) studies with insufficient data.

(2) studies under narrative, systematic review, and meta-analyses.

(3) comments, proceedings, or study protocols.

(4) conference papers.

S.1.3 Data Extraction, Primary Outcomes, and Additional Analyses

The extraction and cross-checking of the data were done by two authors (C.S. and A.M). The primary means of communication for data inquiries and validation was through email. The process of synthesizing each study was generated by a diagnostic test accuracy (DTA) and a systematic review process consequentially. Data gathered in the meta-analyses were mostly about accuracy, sensitivity, and specificity of the diagnostic performance based on endoscopic imaging in each study.

Furthermore, as subgroup analysis composed of the origin of data was recorded geographically. The type of endoscopic image, type of CAD methods, and type of esophageal cancer was as well provided in the subgroup table for further analysis.

S.1.4 Study Inclusion

A total of 1460 results were distinguished upon searching in Google Scholar and 2 additional records were considered through thoroughly searching. 602 articles were excluded after considering the years these articles were published since this review will solely focus on articles published in recent years (2017-2022). Articles with full-text access were also observed making up about 492 articles considered to be excluded. A total of 366 articles were left to be reviewed. Among these 366 records were articles with incomplete data, narrative reviews and meta-analyses, comments, and conference papers which are part of the exclusion criteria. Eventually, 8 studies were included in this review. Supplementary figure 1 shows the flowchart of the selection process.



Figure S1. Search Process Flowchart

S2. Quality Analysis

A precise and detailed information from a study to be reviewed is essential and considered to be a good quality for a precise inference. This precise conclusion improves CAD methods in data training and learning. In this study, a couple of esophageal cancer lesion images and involved esophageal cancer patients were the main contributor of data needed for training. Nonetheless, risk of bias and concerns regarding applicability must be used since not all studies in this review provided detailed description of the patient enrollment standard, index test, and reference standard. All studies were in "low risk" in terms of concerns regarding applicability. Maktabi et al. and Grigoroiu et al. were labelled as "unclear risk" in terms of index test due to the absence of primary outcomes as well as values for specificity and sensitivity. Study by Grigoroiu et al. also received "unclear risk" in reference standard and flow and timing due to the lack of supporting data for their stated average consistency in diagnostic accuracy.

S2.1 QUADAS-2

This section summarizes the QUADAS-2 outcome of the eight studies for this review. It contains the applicability concerns and the level of risk of bias of the studies based on flow and timing, patient selection, reference standard, and index test. Each study was reviewed under flow and timing, patient selection, reference standard, and index test for the risk of bias as well as under patient selection, reference standard, and index test for applicability concerns.



Figure S2. QUADAS-2 Domain

S3. Forest Plot

This section provides forest plots of specificity and sensitivity for different classifications relevant in this study such as for the studies involved and for the CAD methods. The forest plot explains the quality of the data involved in each classification under the 95% level of confidence with their upper limits and lower limits. The quality of the data from forest plot can be interpreted in accordance with the line of no effect. The line of no effect used in this study was calculated by deriving the average of the specificity and sensitivity of the data involved in each classification. The data overlapping the line of no effect describes the data as a low-performance data. By contrast, the data without overlapping the line of no effect infers the high performance of the data.



Figure S3. Sensitivity and Specificity Forest Plot (Methods)



Figure S4. Sensitivity and Specificity Forest Plot (Studies)

S4. Deeks' Funnel Plot

This section shows the Deeks' funnel plot for different classifications such as type of image, CAD methods, and nationality. This funnel plot is provided for evaluating publication bias. It involves the square root of the dataset and the ratio of diagnostic odds. The regression line is also provided to ensure the consideration of the meta-analytical estimate of the publication biases.



Figure S5. Deeks' Funnel Plot for Image Type



Figure S6. Deeks' Funnel Plot for CAD Methods



Figure S7. Deeks' Funnel Plot for Nationality

S5. Accuracy Chart

This section shows the accuracy chart of the data based on the CAD methods and its performance in different types of images. The accuracy chart is provided for a better visualization of the data and comparison of the results



Figure S8. Accuracy Chart of CAD Methods Based on the Type of Endoscopic Image

S6. Summary of Computations for Forest Plots

This section shows the computations obtained for each forest plot. It contains the mean and confidence level that are essential in plotting the forest plots.

Sensitivity (%) (CNN)	
Mean	85.2375
Standard Error	3.662159
Median	87.2
Mode	#N/A
Standard Deviation	7.324317
Sample Variance	53.64563
Kurtosis	2.699393
Skewness	-1.45017
Range	17.05
Minimum	74.75
Maximum	91.8
Sum	340.95
Count	4
Confidence Level(95.0%)	11.65462
UPPER CI	96.89212
LOWER CI	73.58288

Specificity (%) (CNN)	
Mean	90.05
Standard Error	1.890547
Median	89.15
Mode	#N/A
Standard Deviation	3.781093
Sample Variance	14.29667
Kurtosis	-1.1573
Skewness	0.86442
Range	8.1
Minimum	86.9
Maximum	95
Sum	360.2
Count	4
Confidence Level(95.0%)	6.016563
UPPER CI	96.06656
LOWER CI	-6.01656

Sensitivity (%) (SVM)	
Mean	72.68857
Standard Error	6.375529
Median	83.7
Mode	#N/A
Standard Deviation	16.86806
Sample Variance	284.5316
Kurtosis	-0.93969
Skewness	-0.8583
Range	41.9
Minimum	44.8
Maximum	86.7
Sum	508.82
Count	7
Confidence Level(95.0%)	15.60036
UPPER CI	88.28893
LOWER CI	57.08821

Specificity (%) (SVM)	
Mean	68.7
Standard Error	4.002083
Median	70.3
Mode	#N/A
Standard Deviation	10.58852
Sample Variance	112.1167
Kurtosis	-0.59887
Skewness	-0.25294
Range	30.2
Minimum	52
Maximum	82.2
Sum	480.9
Count	7
Confidence Level(95.0%)	9.792744
UPPER CI	78.49274
LOWER CI	58.90726

Sensitivity (%) (k-NN)	
Mean	27.5
Standard Error	6.116916
Median	26.5
Mode	17

Specificity (%) (k-NN)	
Mean	70.5
Standard Error	5.780715
Median	69.5
Mode	#N/A

Standard Deviation	12.23383
Sample Variance	149.6667
Kurtosis	-5.47262
Skewness	0.091753
Range	23
Minimum	17
Maximum	40
Sum	110
Count	4
Confidence Level(95.0%)	19.46676
UPPER CI	46.96676
LOWER CI	8.033242

Standard Deviation	11.56143
Sample Variance	133.6667
Kurtosis	-3.27912
Skewness	0.295073
Range	25
Minimum	59
Maximum	84
Sum	282
Count	4
Confidence Level(95.0%)	18.39682
UPPER CI	88.89682
LOWER CI	52.10318

Sensitivity (%) (RF)	
Mean	37.25
Standard Error	18.75
Median	37.25
Mode	#N/A
Standard Deviation	26.5165
Sample Variance	703.125
Kurtosis	#DIV/0!
Skewness	#DIV/0!
Range	37.5
Minimum	18.5
Maximum	56
Sum	74.5
Count	2
Confidence Level(95.0%)	238.2413
UPPER CI	275.4913
LOWER CI	-200.991

Specificity (%) (RF)	
Mean	71.5
Standard Error	9.5
Median	71.5
Mode	#N/A
Standard Deviation	13.43503
Sample Variance	180.5
Kurtosis	#DIV/0!
Skewness	#DIV/0!
Range	19
Minimum	62
Maximum	81
Sum	143
Count	2
Confidence Level(95.0%)	120.7089
UPPER CI	192.2089
LOWER CI	-49.2089

Sensitivity (%) (MLP)	
Mean	47.85
Standard Error	25.85
Median	47.85
Mode	#N/A
Standard Deviation	36.55742
Sample Variance	1336.445
Kurtosis	#DIV/0!
Skewness	#DIV/0!
Range	51.7

Specificity (%) (MLP)	
Mean	76.15
Standard Error	1.15
Median	76.15
Mode	#N/A
Standard Deviation	1.626346
Sample Variance	2.645
Kurtosis	#DIV/0!
Skewness	#DIV/0!
Range	2.3

Minimum	22
Maximum	73.7
Sum	95.7
Count	2
Confidence Level(95.0%)	328.4554
UPPER CI	376.3054
LOWER CI	-280.605

Minimum	75
Maximum	77.3
Sum	152.3
Count	2
Confidence Level(95.0%)	14.61214
UPPER CI	90.76214
LOWER CI	61.53786

Sensitivity (%) (Robust Boost)	
Mean	63
Standard Error	0
Median	63
Mode	#N/A
Standard Deviation	#DIV/0!
Sample Variance	#DIV/0!
Kurtosis	#DIV/0!
Skewness	#DIV/0!
Range	0
Minimum	63
Maximum	63
Sum	63
Count	1
Confidence Level(95.0%)	#NUM!
UPPER CI	63
LOWER CI	63

Specificity (%) (Robust Boost)	
Mean	65
Standard Error	0
Median	65
Mode	#N/A
Standard Deviation	#DIV/0!
Sample Variance	#DIV/0!
Kurtosis	#DIV/0!
Skewness	#DIV/0!
Range	0
Minimum	65
Maximum	65
Sum	65
Count	1
Confidence Level(95.0%)	#NUM!
UPPER CI	65
LOWER CI	65

Sensitivity (%) (Ada Boost)	
Mean	56
Standard Error	0
Median	56
Mode	#N/A
Standard Deviation	#DIV/0!
Sample Variance	#DIV/0!
Kurtosis	#DIV/0!
Skewness	#DIV/0!
Range	0
Minimum	56
Maximum	56
Sum	56
Count	1
Confidence Level(95.0%)	#NUM!

Specificity (%) (Ada Boost)	
Mean	63
Standard Error	0
Median	63
Mode	#N/A
Standard Deviation	#DIV/0!
Sample Variance	#DIV/0!
Kurtosis	#DIV/0!
Skewness	#DIV/0!
Range	0
Minimum	63
Maximum	63
Sum	63
Count	1
Confidence Level(95.0%)	#NUM!

UPPER CI	56	**UPPER CI**	63
LOWER CI	56	**LOWER CI**	63

Table S1. Sensitivity and Specificity Computations for Forest Plot (CAD Method)

SENSITIVITY TSAI	
Mean	89.65
Standard Error	2.15
Median	89.65
Mode	#N/A
Standard Deviation	3.040559
Sample Variance	9.245
Kurtosis	#DIV/0!
Skewness	#DIV/0!
Range	4.3
Minimum	87.5
Maximum	91.8
Sum	179.3
Count	2
Confidence Level(95.0%)	27.31834

SPECIFICITY TSAI	
Mean	89.15
Standard Error	1.85
Median	89.15
Mode	#N/A
Standard Deviation	2.616295
Sample Variance	6.845
Kurtosis	#DIV/0!
Skewness	#DIV/0!
Range	3.7
Minimum	87.3
Maximum	91
Sum	178.3
Count	2
Confidence Level(95.0%)	23.50648

SENSITIVITY MAKTABI 2019	
Mean	28.2
Standard Error	5.835095
Median	24.75
Mode	#N/A
Standard Deviation	11.67019
Sample Variance	136.1933
Kurtosis	2.002339
Skewness	1.43574
Range	26.3
Minimum	18.5
Maximum	44.8
Sum	112.8
Count	4
Confidence Level(95.0%)	18.56988

SPECIFICITY MAKTABI 2019	
Mean	72.125
Standard Error	4.001953
Median	72.75
Mode	#N/A
Standard Deviation	8.003905
Sample Variance	64.0625
Kurtosis	0.13609
Skewness	-0.41535
Range	19
Minimum	62
Maximum	81
Sum	288.5
Count	4
Confidence Level(95.0%)	12.736

SENSITIVITY HOHMANN	
Mean	59.6
Standard Error	2.063977

SPECIFICITY HOHMANN	
Mean	61
Standard Error	2.302173

Median	57
Mode	56
Standard Deviation	4.615192
Sample Variance	21.3
Kurtosis	-1.95794
Skewness	0.807702
Range	10
Minimum	56
Maximum	66
Sum	298
Count	5
Confidence Level(95.0%)	5.730518

Median	63
Mode	63
Standard Deviation	5.147815
Sample Variance	26.5
Kurtosis	4.192951
Skewness	-1.97922
Range	13
Minimum	52
Maximum	65
Sum	305
Count	5
Confidence Level(95.0%)	6.391857

SENSITIVITY NAKANO	
Mean	85.255
Standard Error	0.757644
Median	85.31
Mode	#N/A
Standard Deviation	1.515289
Sample Variance	2.2961
Kurtosis	-5.23444
Skewness	-0.06715
Range	3
Minimum	83.7
Maximum	86.7
Sum	341.02
Count	4
Confidence Level(95.0%)	2.411163

SPECIFICITY NAKANO	
Mean	75.975
Standard Error	2.954199
Median	75.7
Mode	#N/A
Standard Deviation	5.908398
Sample Variance	34.90917
Kurtosis	-4.96807
Skewness	0.099157
Range	11.9
Minimum	70.3
Maximum	82.2
Sum	303.9
Count	4
Confidence Level(95.0%)	9.40158

SENSITIVITY GRIGOROIU	
Mean	86.9
Standard Error	0
Median	86.9
Mode	#N/A
Standard Deviation	#DIV/0!
Sample Variance	#DIV/0!
Kurtosis	#DIV/0!
Skewness	#DIV/0!
Range	0
Minimum	86.9
Maximum	86.9

SPECIFICITY GRIGOROIU	
Mean	86.9
Standard Error	0
Median	86.9
Mode	#N/A
Standard Deviation	#DIV/0!
Sample Variance	#DIV/0!
Kurtosis	#DIV/0!
Skewness	#DIV/0!
Range	0
Minimum	86.9
Maximum	86.9

Sum	86.9
Count	1
Confidence Level(95.0%)	#NUM!

Sum	86.9
Count	1
Confidence Level(95.0%)	#NUM!

SENSITIVITY MAKTABI 2022	
Mean	73.7
Standard Error	0
Median	73.7
Mode	#N/A
Standard Deviation	#DIV/0!
Sample Variance	#DIV/0!
Kurtosis	#DIV/0!
Skewness	#DIV/0!
Range	0
Minimum	73.7
Maximum	73.7
Sum	73.7
Count	1
Confidence Level(95.0%)	#NUM!

SPECIFICITY MAKTABI 2022	
Mean	77.3
Standard Error	0
Median	77.3
Mode	#N/A
Standard Deviation	#DIV/0!
Sample Variance	#DIV/0!
Kurtosis	#DIV/0!
Skewness	#DIV/0!
Range	0
Minimum	77.3
Maximum	77.3
Sum	77.3
Count	1
Confidence Level(95.0%)	#NUM!

SENSITIVITY WU	
Mean	74.75
Standard Error	0
Median	74.75
Mode	#N/A
Standard Deviation	#DIV/0!
Sample Variance	#DIV/0!
Kurtosis	#DIV/0!
Skewness	#DIV/0!
Range	0
Minimum	74.75
Maximum	74.75
Sum	74.75
Count	1
Confidence Level(95.0%)	#NUM!

SPECIFICITY WU	
Mean	95
Standard Error	0
Median	95
Mode	#N/A
Standard Deviation	#DIV/0!
Sample Variance	#DIV/0!
Kurtosis	#DIV/0!
Skewness	#DIV/0!
Range	0
Minimum	95
Maximum	95
Sum	95
Count	1
Confidence Level(95.0%)	#NUM!

Table S2. Sensitivity and Specificity Computations for Forest Plot (Studies)

SENSITIVITY NATIONALITY	
Mean	64.77611
Standard Error	5.588325
Median	69.85
Mode	56
Standard Deviation	23.70925
Sample Variance	562.1287
Kurtosis	-0.48399
Skewness	-0.79914
Range	73.3
Minimum	18.5
Maximum	91.8
Sum	1165.97
Count	18
Confidence Level(95.0%)	11.79033

SPECIFICITY NATIONALITY	
Mean	74.16111
Standard Error	2.777891
Median	73.3
Mode	62
Standard Deviation	11.78559
Sample Variance	138.9002
Kurtosis	-0.76215
Skewness	0.04269
Range	43
Minimum	52
Maximum	95
Sum	1334.9
Count	18
Confidence Level(95.0%)	5.860837

SENSITIVITY IMAGE TYPE	
Mean	75.22643
Standard Error	3.529649
Median	79.225
Mode	56
Standard Deviation	13.20674
Sample Variance	174.4179
Kurtosis	-1.54354
Skewness	-0.42347
Range	35.8
Minimum	56
Maximum	91.8
Sum	1053.17
Count	14
Confidence Level(95.0%)	7.625344

SPECIFICITY IMAGE TYPE	
Mean	74.74286
Standard Error	3.435268
Median	74.45
Mode	63
Standard Deviation	12.8536
Sample Variance	165.2149
Kurtosis	-1.01565
Skewness	-0.04936
Range	43
Minimum	52
Maximum	95
Sum	1046.4
Count	14
Confidence Level(95.0%)	7.421446

SENSITIVITY AI	
Mean	59.47476
Standard Error	5.691681
Median	63
Mode	17
Standard Deviation	26.08256
Sample Variance	680.2999

SPECIFICITY AI	
Mean	73.6381
Standard Error	2.580499
Median	75
Mode	63
Standard Deviation	11.82533
Sample Variance	139.8385

Kurtosis	-1.17937
Skewness	-0.45475
Range	74.8
Minimum	17
Maximum	91.8
Sum	1248.97
Count	21
Confidence Level(95.0%)	11.87264

Kurtosis	-0.97928
Skewness	0.052794
Range	43
Minimum	52
Maximum	95
Sum	1546.4
Count	21
Confidence Level(95.0%)	5.382827

SENSITIVITY EC TYPE	
Mean	51.94545
Standard Error	6.562433
Median	56
Mode	56
Standard Deviation	21.76513
Sample Variance	473.7207
Kurtosis	-0.74604
Skewness	-0.25895
Range	68.4
Minimum	18.5
Maximum	86.9
Sum	571.4
Count	11
Confidence Level(95.0%)	14.62201

SPECIFICITY EC TYPE	
Mean	68.88182
Standard Error	3.084266
Median	65
Mode	62
Standard Deviation	10.22935
Sample Variance	104.6396
Kurtosis	-0.45419
Skewness	0.288945
Range	34.9
Minimum	52
Maximum	86.9
Sum	757.7
Count	11
Confidence Level(95.0%)	6.872172

SENSITIVITY YEAR	
Mean	64.22333
Standard Error	9.04438
Median	59.6
Mode	#N/A
Standard Deviation	15.66533
Sample Variance	245.4024
Kurtosis	#DIV/0!
Skewness	1.212412
Range	30.29
Minimum	51.39
Maximum	81.68
Sum	192.67
Count	3
Confidence Level(95.0%)	38.91483

SPECIFICITY YEAR	
Mean	74.09333
Standard Error	6.715272
Median	78.05
Mode	#N/A
Standard Deviation	11.63119
Sample Variance	135.2846
Kurtosis	#DIV/0!
Skewness	-1.35365
Range	22.23
Minimum	61
Maximum	83.23
Sum	222.28
Count	3
Confidence Level(95.0%)	28.89348

OVERALL SENSENSITIVITY	
Mean	16.96503
Standard Error	5.600103
Median	11.87264
Mode	#N/A
Standard Deviation	12.52221
Sample Variance	156.8057
Kurtosis	4.259705
Skewness	2.011039
Range	31.28948
Minimum	7.625344
Maximum	38.91483
Sum	84.82515
Count	5
Confidence Level (95.0%)	15.54838

OVERALL SPECIFICITY	
Mean	73.10344
Standard Error	1.069911
Median	74.09333
Mode	#N/A
Standard Deviation	2.392394
Sample Variance	5.723548
Kurtosis	4.483008
Skewness	-2.0852
Range	5.861039
Minimum	68.88182
Maximum	74.74286
Sum	365.5172
Count	5
Confidence Level (95.0%)	2.970549

Table S2. Sensitivity and Specificity Computations for Meta Regression

S7. Summary of Computations for Deeks' Funnel Plots

This section shows the computations obtained for each Deeks' funnel plot. It contains the regression statistics and the number of observations needed in the funnel plot.

SUMMARY OUTPUT (STUDIES)	
Regression Statistics	
Multiple R	0.603576096
R Square	0.364304103
Adjusted R Square	0.205380129
Standard Error	0.174382799
Observations	6

Table S3. Regression Statistics (Studies)

SUMMARY OUTPUT (IMAGE TYPE)	
Regression Statistics	
Multiple R	0.339189
R Square	0.115049
Adjusted R Square	-0.7699
Standard Error	0.356621
Observations	3

Table S4. Regression Statistics (Image Type)

SUMMARY OUTPUT (CAD METHODS)	
Regression Statistics	
Multiple R	0.713080462
R Square	0.508483746
Adjusted R Square	0.385604682
Standard Error	0.133567518
Observations	6

Table S5. Regression Statistics (CAD Methods)

SUMMARY OUTPUT (NATIONALITY)	
Regression Statistics	
Multiple R	1
R Square	1
Adjusted R Square	65535
Standard Error	0
Observations	2

Table S6. Regression Statistics (Nationality)

SUMMARY OUTPUT (ALL CLASSIFICATION)	
Regression Statistics	
Multiple R	0.571396
R Square	0.326494
Adjusted R Square	-0.01026
Standard Error	7.99E-05
Observations	4

Table S7. Regression Statistics (All Classification)

S8. SROC Curve Computation of p-value

This section shows the computations obtained for the p value needed in the SROC. A p value is essential in determining the heterogeneity of the data involved. p values below 0.05 suggest heterogeneity. By contrast, p values above 0.05 suggest no heterogeneity.

	df	SS	MS	F	p value
Regression	1	0.130330633	0.130330633	2.51988383	0.131981855
Residual	16	0.82753423	0.051720889		
Total	17	0.957864863			

Table S8. p-value (SROC curve)

S9. Deeks' Funnel Plot Computation of p-value

This section shows the computations obtained for the p value needed in the Deeks' funnel plot. A p value is essential in determining the heterogeneity of the data involved. p values below 0.05 suggest heterogeneity. By contrast, p values above 0.05 suggest no heterogeneity.

ANOVA

	df	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*p-value*
Regression	1	0.06970788	0.06970788	2.292317	0.204578481
Residual	4	0.12163744	0.03040936		
Total	5	0.19134533			

Table S9. P-value of Deeks' Funnel Plot (Study)

ANOVA

	df	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*p-value*
Regression	1	0.016534	0.016534	0.13000617	0.779695
Residual	1	0.127178	0.127178		
Total	2	0.143712			

Table S10. P-value of Deeks' Funnel Plot (Image Type)

ANOVA

	df	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*p-value*
Regression	1	0.073825	0.073825	4.138083	0.111674
Residual	4	0.071361	0.01784		
Total	5	0.145186			

Table S11. P-value of Deeks' Funnel Plot (CAD Method)

ANOVA

	df	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*Significance F*
Regression	1	6.19223E-09	6.19E-09	0.969534	0.428603772
Residual	2	1.27736E-08	6.39E-09		
Total	3	1.89658E-08			

Table S12. P-value of Deeks' Funnel Plot (All Classification)